

[Mr R. Nagan Gowda]

[29th January 1929]

difficulties. It is to provide against such difficulties as the one that has been raised by Bellary about this question of language he said that that amendment had been accepted. The report of the Vernacularization Committee is one that has been calculated to improve the status of education, the methods of inculcating or the imparting of education in this country. I am entirely in agreement with the recommendations of the Vernacularization Committee though I am anxious that we the people of Bellary ought to get out of the Andhra University area because of their resolution No. 1 stating that Telugu ought to be adopted. Though I am one of those that feel that Bellary ought to get out of it, I feel that vernacularization is a step forward taken by the Andhra University in the matter of imparting education in this country. Sir, the Vernacularization Committee very clearly and very well stated the point that one cannot but feel strongly that the use of English as the medium of instruction is fraught with evils of a far reaching character and that it cannot produce the results which can reasonably be expected to be produced where vernacular is the medium. In countries where the mother-tongue is the medium of instruction boys and girls learn sciences and other useful subjects much earlier than the students in this country where they have to spend 6 to 10 years in learning a foreign language which they will have to master, so as to be able to study the science or the technical subject. This they can do only after they reach ages of 15 to 18. This would put on them a great handicap for being useful later in life. It is quite easy for students to learn mechanics, chemistry or physics, engineering, etc., much earlier in life than in the case of students who have to study a foreign language first and then alone take up the study of any technical subject. So I am entirely in agreement with the provision that has been made in the Andhra University, to introduce Telugu as the medium of instruction in their institution. Sir, in other institutions in this country, very important institutions, the vernacular has been used and used successfully as the medium of instruction. It is a regrettable thing that we do not have any institution in this part of the Presidency to come forward and take up this question of vernacularization earlier than this. Aligarh has introduced vernacular as the medium of instruction. The Indian Women's University at Poona has been imparting education through the vernacular, and the Usmania University at Hyderabad has been imparting education in science and literature in the vernacular, namely, Urdu."

* The hon. the PRESIDENT :—"The hon. Member will continue his speech at the proper time. The Council will now adjourn and meet again at 2-30 p.m."

After Lunch (2:30 p.m.)

II—cont.

ADJOURNMENT MOTION *re* PERSECUTION OF CONGRESS WORKERS IN VELLORE TALUK, NORTH ARCOT DISTRICT—cont.

Mr. T. ADINARAYANA CHETTIYAR :—"Mr. President, I move the following adjournment motion for which leave has been given by the House, viz.—

'To draw the attention of Government to the recent conduct of the police in the North Arcot district in persecuting Congress workers in the taluk of Vellore, North Arcot distr.ct.'

"It would be a surprise to the House, especially this part of the House (Congress members) that I should come forward with a complaint about the conduct of the police, for it is a well-known fact that many of my colleagues on this side of the House are used to attentions of the police, and some of

29th January 1929]

[Mr. T. Adinarayana Chettiyar]

them have even sojourned in various jails in the various parts of the Presidency. In short, we may say, to quote a well-known expression 'Suffering is the badge of our tribe'. And yet if I come forward to-day and complain—not as suppliants but as demanding our rights—that the police have behaved themselves even worse than in the traditional way in which they are known, nay, expected to behave, there must be something very much wrong somewhere. We all know the state of politics in this country and we also know how even the elementary rights are denied to us. I am not complaining about that. There are other occasions and there are also other places where we would make our complaints. But what I am now complaining of is that the police in North Arcot are going out of their way and adopting methods which some years ago I would have called un-British, but now that I have lived and learnt, probably that word 'un-British' carries with it no meaning because the whole system of administration is so conducted that to call it un-British carries no special odium with it; but that they are surpassing themselves, that is my present complaint. We know that a sort of mild persecution has been going on for quite a long time. We also know that the arm of the police is long enough to reach even distinguished Indians like a Gokhale or a Sapru. We do not complain about that either. But what I am complaining of is that the police are not playing the game. If they play the game we will not object, for we will then know with whom we are dealing and what we should expect from them and we should also have attuned our conduct accordingly. But here they are doing things which no civilized Government or a recognized and accepted code of morality would permit. Therefore we come forward and appeal to the House that the state of affairs such as exists in North Arcot to-day ought to be ended.

"Another reason why I come forward with this motion is that instead of tackling the bigger people of North Arcot, the police seem to have selected the small fry for their attentions. These men are not men of position like Saprus or Sastri but they are small men in the world's eye, they occupy a very poor place among men of property for they have not got money even to engage vakils. It is against such men that the North Arcot police seem to have devoted their special attention for the past some time. The police perhaps are doing this under the impression that they are helping the Government which is feeding them. Probably they are making the country safe for British Raj. But we all know, if the lessons of history are not entirely thrown away, that such conduct on the part of the police does not help the Government but on the other hand tends to bring down the prestige of the Government, on which alone it should take its stand, if it is to last at all. Methods like calling the totis and asking them not to tom-tom Congress meetings and threatening them that they would be shut up in jail if they do so, asking temple trustees not to lend mantapams for the use of the Congress lecturers and asking the village munsif not to give facilities to these Congress workers, these, I complain, are methods that no civilized Government ought to encourage. Another thing is that even the bus owners, who have to wait on and grease the itching palms of the district board head clerk, and of the police, even these people are exploited and they are asked not to carry from one place to another the hated Congress workers, who seem to be treated even worse than lepers were treated of old. But all these would pale into insignificance before some other instances which I am going to acquaint the House with. Active steps, I am told, are being taken to manufacture evidence

[Mr. T. Adinarayana Chettiyar] [29th January 1929]

against these workers. I am told that it is not for every lecture, for every political preacher that shorthand writers are despatched from the headquarters, Vellore. But wherever there are no shorthand-writers village people are, it seems, sought to be coerced by the police to give evidence in a particular manner and to depose that the Congress workers said such and such a thing when they did not certainly say it. Even during the progress of the trial, the so-called trial, a trial in which the accused very conveniently for the Government do not seek to defend themselves, instead of giving every facility according to the canons of British justice, they are given no facility at all. In the recent case (it is not *sub judice*) the magistrate would probably have given time to the accused to procure the necessary counsel. Nothing would have been lost, no Government would be in danger thereby, certainly not the British Government, such a mighty Government—a Government on which the sun never sets. But, these five accused became so important that allowing them a week's time was considered very dangerous to the British Empire in the mind of the magistrate. The poor magistrate is not to blame, it is the police that are ruling the magistracy, and even the District Magistrate is like wax in their hands. Here a word has to be said about the magistracy in North Arcot. Unfortunately, at this moment, the magistracy in the North Arcot district is not known to be either strong or praiseworthy in other directions."

The hon. the PRESIDENT :—" May I remind the hon. Member that the motion refers only to the conduct of the police ? "

Mr. T. ADINARAYANA CHETTIYAR :—" I just touched on the conduct of the magistrate, simply because they are acting as the mouthpiece of the police. My complaint however is about the police. They seem to dictate the policy to the magistrates."

The hon. the PRESIDENT :—" On this occasion, the hon. Member has to confine himself to the complaints against the police."

* Mr. T. ADINARAYANA CHETTIYAR :—" My information is that for the most frivolous reason and more often for no reason at all the police go and inform the willing magistrates that allowing a certain speaker to lecture is dangerous to the peace of the district. At once the magistrate issues orders which will not stand even a minute's examination at the hands of a sound lawyer."

The hon. the PRESIDENT :—" I am sorry the hon. Member is persisting in his reference to the conduct of the magistracy."

* Mr. T. ADINARAYANA CHETTIYAR :—" The demeanour of the police has become absolutely intolerable. In one of the public meetings which the police and the local sub-magistrate attended, they told the lecturer not to talk about swaraj or independence but to talk only about khaddar or untouchability. Sir, if the time has come for an ordinary sub-inspector of police or an acting sub-magistrate to go and dictate to an experienced or seasoned political speaker on which subject he should talk, I wish for the sake of goodness that the Government, if they are going to persist in their policy, should publish a manual of the subjects on which the Congress workers might talk. That would be far better or more honest than harassing the poor people in this manner."

29th January 1929]

[Mr. T. Adinarayana Chettiyar]

• “The discrimination which the police are making in paying their attention to some people is even worse. While they take particular care to wink at the actions of certain school of, what I may call, political thought in the country they pay their special attention to another set of people belonging to a different school of politics. For instance, in Vellore, just a few weeks back, there were two rival meetings going on on rival platforms on the well-known parade ground near the Fort. One was addressed in very strong language—I do not want to call it violent—by some persons belonging to the Self-Respect wing of the Justice party, and the other platform was occupied by a speaker belonging to the Congress party. While the police took no action in trying even to control the speakers of the Self-Respecting denomination, they came in full force and served an order which had been ready probably for several hours upon the Congress worker. I will ask whether British justice means winking at one set of political speakers and harassing another set of political speakers. I never knew it until I read the reports of the proceedings (I have the reports with me) that the police officers who were paid from the public exchequer are allowed to identify themselves with one political school of thought and deal severely with the other. I thought the magistracy and the police were above all political parties. At any rate, they ought not to give vent to their private feelings in this manner.

“Another thing I have to mention is the well-known canon of administration followed by all civilized and enlightened Governments by which not only the administration should be just but it should be so conducted as to convince the world that they are just. But the doings of the police in North Arcot give strong room for suspecting that they are not only not just, but they are unnecessarily harsh and overbearing and are adopting methods which no civilized administration could condone, much less approve of.

“There is also the feeling, a strong feeling too, that all this sinister activity is a preparation for the forthcoming elections. If there is any truth in that surmise, I may tell Government that such a policy deserves the strongest condemnation. Sir, there is also a feeling that the Simon Commission are going to visit North Arcot district and that the police want to make that district fit for the reception of the Simonites. I do not know whether the future constitution of the Government of India is going to depend upon the visit of the Simon Commission to the North Arcot district or upon the way in which they are going to be received in that district, as though the Commission are going to base their recommendations upon the grave-yard-like peace that will reign in North Arcot when all the Congress workers are safely locked up in jails, or from the addresses which they will receive from the loyal people of that district. Whatever it be, let not the police harass the poor workers who have rightly or wrongly taken a vow not to defend themselves in a court of law if they are prosecuted. To harass such a people, taking advantage of their position that they do not plead their cases before British courts, is a course which even Simonites would not be proud of, for I take it, Sir John Simon is a Briton brought up in the tradition of British Justice.”

The hon. the PRESIDENT:—“The hon. Member will have to bring his remarks to a close.”

[29th January 1929]

* Mr. T. ADINARAYANA CHETTIYAR :—“ Even the place for the trial of these cases is carefully selected by the police. For one batch of cases Vellore was perhaps originally fixed. But afterwards the cases seem to have been transferred to Arkonam where there is not a single vakil to defend the poor people, no not even within 20 or 30 miles of that place. Would any civilized Government tolerate this for a moment ?

“ I wish to mention only one other point. I would appeal to the sense of fairness and to the commonly understood canons of public administration, viz., that greater consideration should be shown to a man who is not able to or who does not defend himself at the bar than to a man who is well able to defend himself or who would command legal help. The Congress workers are men who have taken a vow not to defend themselves in a court of law. The Magistrate at Arkonam was, I understand, about to give adjournment when it was applied for, but at the last moment evidently owing to the influence of the Deputy Superintendent of Police he refused to grant a short adjournment. Such is the influence which the all powerful police wields over the magistracy.”

The hon. Diwan Bahadur M. KRISHNAN NAYAR :—“ Sir, although you ruled that to refer to magistrates was out of order, yet he is going on referring to them.”

* Mr. T. ADINARAYANA CHETTIYAR :—“ The hon. the Law Member thinks that even the word ‘magistrate’ should not be mentioned. I humbly differ from him. I was only mentioning how the magistracy would not dare stand up independently of the police.

“ Finally I submit, it is not a local question. Although I am obliged to restrict my remarks, under the rules and standing orders, to a particular portion of the North Arcot district, repression is unfortunately becoming more and more widespread, and so the question is no longer a local question. So I want the House to view this as a larger question, a question on which peace and the good name of the Government will depend. It is also an urgent question. Are we to allow the police to go on trampling under their feet our very elementary rights? I request the House to vote for this proposition unanimously thus bringing pressure to bear upon the Government to realize the utter un-British, unjust and absolutely reprehensible methods followed by the police in the North Arcot district in their dealings with Congress workers.”

Mr. C. VENKATARAM NAYUDU :—“ I do not desire to say more than two words on the motion before the House. In the first place I cannot believe that the police of my district are carrying on this notorious campaign against Congress workers without the support, if not at the instigation of the Government whose recent policy in relation to political propaganda belies, I am sorry to say, all the past political record of the present Law Member. He has no need to seek the support of any constituency for this reactionary policy for he has become part of the bureaucracy, that really rules the country. But I did not expect that this would have bred in him such gross disregard for the political aims and ideals of this country which are deliberately attacked by his policy. It is therefore our duty to carry this vote of censure against the Government. In the next place I feel that in carrying out the policy of the Government, the police of the North Arcot district have behaved towards the

29th January 1929] [Mr. C. Venkatarangam Nayudu]

Congress workers in a manner which not only constitutes a gross abuse of their powers but indicates an animus against them which it is the duty of the Government to put down. I have had information, Sir, to say that these Congress workers have been pursued by the police from place to place and that the hospitable people in villages have been asked to deny them food and lodging and that even jutka-wallahs and bus-owners were persuaded to decline to carry them in their conveyances. Such petty persecutions is unworthy of any administration professing to be model and civilized. I support the motion."

The hon. the PRESIDENT :—"The question is that the business of the House be adjourned."

* The hon. Khan Bahadur Sir Muhammad USMAN SAHIB Bahadur :—"Sir I was listening very carefully to the speech of the hon. the Mover when he drew the attention of the Government to the alleged recent conduct of the police in the North Arcot district. My hon. Friend made a number of petty allegations regarding the conduct of the police. I do not think he has brought to the notice of this House any specific instance giving the name of the policeman who has done the wrong. I may assure the House that the Government have not issued any instructions to the police that they should in any way persecute the Congress workers. I may assure the House that we make no distinction between Congress workers and non-Congress workers. I asked the Inspector-General of Police this afternoon whether he knew of any differentiation being made by the police in the treatment of Congress workers. He assured me that no such state of affairs exists. If my hon. Friend brings to my notice specific cases in which the police were trying to persecute Congress workers, I promise him that I will bestow my earnest attention. Although he has made certain vague allegations in his speech without bringing to my notice any specific cases, I promise to look into those allegations and forward them to the Inspector-General, if necessary. I hope that with this assurance the hon. Member will not press the motion to a division."

* Mr. K. V. R. SWAMI :—"I never intended to speak on this motion but after hearing the hon. the Home Member, I feel that I must say a few words on it. The hon. the Home Member has got a very highly paid Police department under him and a very efficient Criminal Investigation Department under him and we are paying nearly two crores of rupees for them. He seems to be quite helpless in this matter and the Inspector-General of Police is another unfortunate man who is also equally helpless. These officers are paid very high salaries and they ask my hon. Friend, Mr. Adinarayana Chettiyar, to come to their rescue. They say 'we do not know what mischief has been done by the police ; we are very anxious to know whether they make any distinction between Congress workers and non-Congress workers. If you will give us specific instances then we will take action.' If my hon. Friend the Home Member were to receive any such specific instance, then, I think he would quietly forward it to the Inspector-General of Police, who in turn, I think, would give it the most careful consideration in course of time, perhaps after Simon & Co. have come and gone. My friend is quite satisfied with the reply given by the Inspector-General of Police regarding this matter as he is always satisfied with everything that is said and done in his department. I do not know what these highly paid police officers are doing. If there are honest people going over to this Presidency, then they will be watching them and

[Mr. K. V. R. Swami]

[29th January 1929]

take very good care of them. If unfortunately innocent people are being prosecuted for doing propaganda work and if they are persecuted by the police people then these C.I.D. men do not consider it as their duty to find out who were those that were responsible for such persecution. But this much I may say : that the hon. the Home Member has not uttered any lie. He has not stated that he has made enquiries through the Inspector-General and that he came to the conclusion that no such persecution was going on in the North Arcot district. We must give him credit to that extent. What he says is there is nothing reported to the Inspector General, there is nothing reported to the hon. the Home Member and the latter is satisfied."

The hon. the PRESIDENT :—"I am afraid the hon. Member is repeating his own arguments."

* Mr. K. V. R. SWAMI :—"What I submit is, we cannot give any weight to such a statement like that, unless he would promise us to make enquiries and see that such things as complained of in the adjournment motion are not repeated. Unless he gives the House such an undertaking, I am afraid we have to press the motion. My hon. Friend, Mr. Adinarayana Chettiyar, has brought to the notice of this House certain atrocities committed by the police and we must see that they are rectified by the Government. On that point we have not got any assurance from the hon. the Home Member that he would see that these things are not repeated. He says he would not take action unless individual cases are reported to him. That is the result of his statement."

3 p.m.

* Mr. A. KALESWARA RAO :—"Mr. President, Sir, it seems to be the rule with the Government, whenever the Simon Commission is going to visit a particular place, to put the members of the opposite political party under proper restraint, so that the place may be made safe for a grand reception to the Commission. That has been the experience in Madras and in all parts of Northern India. We now see that things are repeating themselves. There is a rumour that the Simon Commission is going to visit North Arcot. The Commission would not publish their programme beforehand, for they are afraid of the boycotters who will create an unpleasant situation for them and not allow a warm reception to be given to them. Therefore they always go in gosha, visit a place suddenly, get some reception and suddenly leave the place to another place. But somehow the rumour leaked out and the Congress workers have been busy in North Arcot in preparing a reception to the Commission in their own way. The police are hunting after them. Of course there is the other party which holds a different opinion from us and we have no quarrel with them ; but Government have no business to side with one or the other. The police, the representatives of the Government, are the instruments of oppression and persecution. Their action has created a terror in the minds of the people there. The jutka-wallahs are afraid. The householders are terrorized to give these people food and water. If any of them receives a Congressman in his house he is victimized. A reign of terror has been created in the district. The reception to the Simon Commission is being arranged in this way ; at any rate that is the feeling in distant parts of the country also. The police are persistently carrying on tales to the magistrate against Congress workers and they induce him to issue orders under the preventive sections of the Criminal Procedure Code. The notorious section 144 is abused."

29th January 1929]

The hon. the PRESIDENT :—" I am afraid the hon. Member is not relevant ; the question is the persecution of the police and not the police troubling the magistrate."

* Mr. A. KALESWARA RAO :—" I am not speaking of the magistrate, Sir.

" All this is done against the Congress party, the party of the boycotters. I fear that this is also done as a preliminary step to the general elections that will be coming on this year, in order to create an impression that unless the persons were in the good books of the Government they might be harassed. The people are made to believe that these things will be continued till then. If the Government want to be a just and enlightened Government it must make a thorough enquiry into the matter and warn the police officers against such things. There is no use of saying that instances are not brought to the notice of the hon. the Home Member. We are reading of many of them in the newspapers. It is the duty of the hon. the Member for Order, though not the Member for Law, though Law and Order go together, to see that these things do not happen. If they want to find out whether the people are going to welcome the Commission and give evidence before them, they ought to leave the people free without any harassment by the police. I should characterize the reply of the hon. the Member for Order as unsatisfactory and disappointing and hence there is no reason for withdrawal of the motion for adjournment at this stage."

* Mr. S. ARPUDASWAMI UDAYAR :—" Mr. President, Sir, I would not have intervened in the debate but for the fact that certain speakers here have drawn inferences not at all warranted by the reply of the hon. the Home Member. When my hon. Friend from Vellore spoke of a persecution, I thought that he had facts and figures with him and that he was going to substantiate them. He spoke of discrimination between parties and parties. Here again, beyond generalizations, I hardly found any specific allegation. My hon. Friend from Bezvada spoke of a rumour of the visit of the Simon Commission to Vellore. I ask, is it fair on the part of Members of this House to base any conclusion merely on rumours and their probable connexion with the action of the police in particular places. I have no idea whatever of anything going on in North Arcot and I think it will be the same case with many other Members also. The hon. the Home Member said that he would enquire into the matter if specific instances of police exceeding their powers were brought to his notice. Whether the Simon Commission is going to visit North Arcot or not is not known to the Members of this House, nor even to the Members of the Cabinet as an answer given to a question on that point showed. How, then, can we base this alleged connexion between the action of the police and the visit of the Simon Committee on mere rumour? Rather are we not justified in coming to the conclusion that this adjournment motion is brought forward in order to create a prejudice against the Simon Commission visiting any mufassal station in the minds of the Members of this House and the people of this Province? It is not fair, I think, for my friends to carry on what looks like propaganda work in this Council. If they want our votes, let them ask for them in a straightforward way. There are no substantiated facts. We are told that people were taken to Arkonam and . . . Are these questions to be decided by the House when the facts are not proven? It was said that the magistrate did not grant adjournments, that the Deputy Superintendent of Police objected to an adjournment being granted. It was

[Mr. S. Arpudaswami Udayar] [29th January 1929]

quite within his power to say that if an adjournment was given he could not conduct his case. Lawyer friends know very well how they fight for and against adjournments sometimes tooth and nail. These are things well within the discretion of the courts. To bring all these things here with the slender evidence available and to ask the Members of this Council to give their vote is to bring down the prestige of the House."

MR. P. ANJANEYULU :—"Mr. President, Sir, I am not very much surprised to see that the original text of the hon. the Home Member is well explained by the running commentary of the hon. Member from Trichinopoly. In some places the commentary excels the original text. While the hon. the Home Member was satisfied with saying that these were only vague allegations against the police in that part of the Presidency, the hon. Member for Trichinopoly says that the members of the honourable profession of law are, here as elsewhere, playing their trade tricks. (Mr. S. ARPUDASWAMI UDAYAR : 'I never said that.') The honourable profession is brought to the level of a trade. I think it is an unfortunate slip of the otherwise guarded language of the hon. Member.

"Coming to the question of the interference of the police with the legitimate activities of Congressmen in a particular locality, it is not possible for us, non-official members of the House, to give more than what we have given as evidence. Supposing a petty official of the Government entertained a Congressman in his house—Indian hospitality is proverbial—he is harassed and worried; and hence he will be the last man to expose himself lest he should get more and more trouble from this department or that department.

3-15 p.m. "We are under a moral obligation not to say the source of information. We say that certain things are happening being the outcome of the doings of the police. It is up to the Government to rectify the mistakes if they want to make themselves popular. I take it that the hon. the Home Member was really earnest when he said that he would take the matter seriously, make an earnest effort and see that no distinction was drawn between one set of people and another whether they were Congressmen or non-Congressmen. I am thankful to him so far. That is the sort of spirit that hon. Members of this House must inspire in the otherwise adamant hearts of the Members of the Treasury Benches. Instead of doing that, you should not abet or even believe that our facts are not correct, because our facts may not be strong. If there is sufficient evidence, we can take the case to a court of law instead of asking hon. Members of the Treasury Benches to make enquiries. We will, then, put the case in the court of law and secure justice. Because it is not possible in some cases, hon. Members of this House come forward with certain allegations that in a certain locality, the Police Department are doing things which are not always right in the eye of law. It is these custodians of peace themselves that administer law and order—these petty officials of the lower grade, I am not speaking of the higher grade, of the rank and file of the Police Department—that are responsible for more crimes in the land than the people themselves. It is they who go out of their way when petty offences of doubtful nature occur."

The hon. the PRESIDENT :—"I think the hon. Member will be in order if he confines himself to the persecutions in the North Arcot district by the police. The hon. Member is requested to confine his remarks to Vellore taluk of the North Arcot district."

29th January 1929]

Mr. P. ANJANEYULU :—" In the Vellore taluk of the North Arcot district it is our information that the police go out of their way and persecute Congress workers by following them to certain meetings. Where some of these young men belonging to the Congress party are persecuted, it is our information that in one of the meetings the person that is run after was never present; in another meeting he was present but never delivered a speech. According to our information—we cannot prove it to the hilt—the police sent a report to the sub-magistrate concerned that the gentleman had been present in three or four meetings and that he had delivered speeches in three or four meetings, which were of an inflammatory nature and of setting one class of persons against another. That sort of vague information is supplied to the sub-magistrate and he forthwith issued orders under section 144. . . "

Mr. ALLADI KRISHNASWAMI AYYAR :—" Is the hon. Member in order to refer to the magistrates ? "

* The hon. the PRESIDENT :—" I think the hon. Member will certainly agree that he is not right in referring to the magistracy on this motion. "

Mr. P. ANJANEYULU :—" I was referring only in so far as the police induced the magistrate to prosecute the Congressmen. I will be within my legitimate limits if I referred to that point only. Why I am referring to the magistrates is this; the police ask the magistrates indirectly to issue these orders and to prosecute some people. The police induce the magistrates to prosecute people by giving false reports to the latter. The magistrates issue orders on these false reports. As far as my district is concerned the Police Superintendent. . . "

* The hon. the PRESIDENT :—" The hon. Member may avail himself of another opportunity to extol the police officials in his district. "

Mr. P. ANJANEYULU :—" The Superintendents of Police act on the information given by the subordinates. The subordinates, generally constables and head constables, send reports to the department and the magistrate. The magistrates generally come from clerical posts. The magistrate may be an acting man. If he does not take drastic action on such matters, the department may come down upon him. Without examining the details of the case, without looking at the justice of the case he issues the order. This is the trouble. It is for the Government, when certain allegations are made, when certain information is supplied, to give us more information, to examine the question, to ask the superior officers—responsible officers—to go into the matter on the spot, and not leave the matter entirely in the hands of the rank and file of the department but to see that justice is done. For this reason this motion is tabled. I hope it will be taken in the spirit and the earnestness with which this motion is brought forward. The Treasury Bench will have to give their best consideration to the motion. "

Mr. W. P. A. SOUNDARAPANDIA NADAR :—" I move, Sir, that the question be now put. "

* The hon. the PRESIDENT :—" The question is that the question be put. "

The closure motion was put and declared carried.

[29th January 1929]

A poll was demanded and the House divided as follows :—

Ayes.

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1. The hon. Sir Norman Marjoribanks. | 30. Mr. M. V. Gargadhara Siva. |
| 2. " Khan Bahadur Sir Muhammad Usman Sahib Bahadur. | 31. Rao Sahib L. C. Guruswami. |
| 3. " Mr. T. E. Moir. | 32. Mr. V. I. Muniswami Pillai. |
| 4. " Diwan Bahadur M. Krishnan Nayar. | 33. " W. P. A. Soundarapandia Nadar. |
| 5. " Mr. M. R. Seturatnam Ayyar. | 34. " S. Subrahmanya Mooppanar. |
| 6. " S. Muthiah Mudaliyar. | 35. " Daniel Thomas. |
| 7. " Dr. P. Subbarayan. | 36. " S. Venkiah. |
| 8. Dr. (Mrs.) S. Muthulakshmi Reddi. | 37. Rai Sahib M. Hampayya. |
| 9. Mr. Alladi Krishnaswami Ayyar. | 38. Rao Sahib R. Srinivasan. |
| 10. Khan Bahadur Muhammad Bazl-ul-lah Sahib Bahadur. | 39. Mr. C. E. Wood. |
| 11. Mr. H. A. Watson. | 40. " W. O. Wright. |
| 12. " C. A. Souter. | 41. " F. E. James. |
| 13. " S. H. Slater. | 42. " R. J. C. Robertson. |
| 14. " A. McG. C. Tampoe. | 43. " H. F. P. Hearson. |
| 15. " C. W. E. Cotton. | 44. " S. N. Dorai Raja. |
| 16. " M. A. Manikkavelu Nayakar. | 45. " S. Arpudaswami Udayar. |
| 17. " Syed Tajuddin Sahib | 46. The Zamindar of Kallikota. |
| 18. Munshi Abdul Wahab Sahib. | 47. Mr. G. R. Premayya. |
| 19. Mr. A. Balakrishna Shetti. | 48. " Swami A. S. Sahajanandam. |
| 20. " C. D. Appavu Chettiyar. | 49. " V. Ramji Rao. |
| 21. " J. Bheemayya. | 50. Rao Bahadur Sir A. P. Patro. |
| 22. " J. A. Davis. | 51. The Maharaja of Venkatagiri. |
| 23. " R. Foulkes. | 52. Diwan Bahadur P. C. Ethirajulu Nayudu. |
| 24. " F. J. Gnanavaram Pillai. | 53. Mr. P. T. Rajan. |
| 25. " Muppli Nayar of Kavalappara. | 54. " T. K. Chidambaranatha Mudaliyar. |
| 26. Subadar-Major S. A. Nanjappa Bahadur. | 55. Khan Bahadur S. K. Abdul Razaq Sahib. |
| 27. Mr. Al. Ar. Narayanan Chettiyar. | 56. Mr. Muhammad Khadir Mohideen Sahib. |
| 28. " T. M. Narayanaswami Pillai. | 57. Diwan Bahadur S. Kumaraswami Reddiyar. |
| 29. " N. Siva Raj. | 58. Mr. T. M. Moidoo Sahib. |
| | 59. Diwan Bahadur A. M. M. Murugappa Chettiyar. |

Noes.

- | | |
|-----------------------------------|--|
| 1. Mr. Sami Venkatachalam Chetti. | 19. Mr. C. Ramasomayajulu. |
| 2. " S. Satyamurti. | 20. " P. Bhaktavatsulu Nayudu. |
| 3. " C. V. Venkataramana Ayyangar | 21. Sriman Biswanath Das Mahasaya. |
| 4. " T. Adinarayana Chettiyar. | 22. Mr. A. Kaleswara Rao. |
| 5. " P. Anjaneyulu. | 23. " R. Srinivasa Ayyangar. |
| 6. " P. C. Venkatapati Raju. | 24. " K. Koti Reddi. |
| 7. " J. A. Saldanha. | 25. " L. K. Tulasiram. |
| 8. " Abdul Hamid Khan Sahib. | 26. " C. Marudavanam Pillai. |
| 9. " C. S. Govindaraja Mudaliyar. | 27. " K. V. Krishnaswami Nayakar. |
| 10. " G. Harisarvottama Rao. | 28. " K. Madhavan Nayar. |
| 11. " C. N. Muthuranga Mudaliyar. | 29. " C. Venkatarangam Nayudu. |
| 12. " K. V. R. Swami. | 30. " B. Venkataratnam. |
| 13. " D. Narayana Raju. | 31. " K. S. Sivasubrahmanya Ayyer. |
| 14. Dr. B. S. Mallaya. | 32. Diwan Bahadur R. N. Arogyaswami Mudaliyar. |
| 15. Mr. Kottal Uppi Sahib. | 33. Mr. R. Nagan Gowda. |
| 16. " K. R. Karant. | 34. Rao Bahadur B. Muniswami Nayudu. |
| 17. " C. Obi Reddi. | |
| 18. " A. Parasurama Rao Pantulu. | |

Ayes 59. Noes 34.

The closure motion was carried.

*The hon. the PRESIDENT :—"The question is that the business of the House be adjourned."

The motion was put and declared lost.

29th January 1929]

• A poll was demanded and the House divided as follows : —

Noes.

- | | |
|---|--|
| 1. The hon. Sir Norman Marjoribanks. | 31. Mr. V. I. Muniswami Pillai. |
| 2. „ Khan Bahadur Sir Muhammad Usman Sahib Bahadur. | 32. „ W. P. A. Soundarapandya Nadar. |
| 3. „ Mr. T. E. Moir. | 33. „ S. Subrahmanya Mooppanar. |
| 4. „ Diwan Bahadur M. Krishnan Nayar. | 34. „ Daniel Thomas. |
| 5. „ Mr. M. R. Seturatnam Ayyar. | 35. „ S. Venkayya. |
| 6. „ Mr. S. Muthiah Mudaliyar. | 36. Rai Sahib M. Hampayya. |
| 7. „ Dr. P. Subbarayan. | 37. Rao Sahib R. Srinivasan. |
| 8. Mr. Alladi Krishnaswami Ayyar. | 38. Mr. E. C. Wood. |
| 9. Khan Bahadur Muhammad Bazzul-lah Sahib Bahadur. | 39. „ W. O. Wright. |
| 10. Mr. H. A. Watson. | 40. „ J. E. James. |
| 11. „ C. A. Souther. | 41. „ R. J. C. Robertson. |
| 12. „ S. H. Slater. | 42. „ H. F. P. Hearson. |
| 13. „ A. McG. C. Tampoe. | 43. Rajkumar S. N. Dorai Raja. |
| 14. „ C. W. E. Cotton. | 44. Mr. S. Arpudasmami Udayar. |
| 15. „ M. A. Manikkavelu Nayakar. | 45. The Zamindar of Kallikota. |
| 16. „ Syed Tajudin Sahib. | 46. Mr. G. R. Premayya. |
| 17. „ Abdul Wahab Sahib. | 47. Swami A. S. Sahajanandam. |
| 18. „ C. D. Appaya Chettiyar. | 48. Mr. V. Ramjee Rao. |
| 19. „ A. Balakrishna Chetti. | 49. Rao Bahadur Sir A. P. Patro. |
| 20. „ J. Bheemayya. | 50. Maharaja of Venkatagiri. |
| 21. „ J. A. Davis. | 51. Diwan Bahadur P. C. Ethirajulu Nayudu. |
| 22. „ R. Foulkes. | 52. Mr. P. T. Rajan. |
| 23. „ P. J. Gnanavaram Pillai. | 53. „ T. K. Chidambaramatha Mudaliyar. |
| 24. „ Kavalappara Muppi Nayar. | 54. Khan Bahadur S. K. Abdul Razack Sahib Bahadur. |
| 25. „ Subadar-Major Nanjappa Bahadur. | 55. Mr. Muhammad Khadir Moideen Sahib. |
| 26. „ Al. Ar. Narayanan Chettiyar. | 56. Diwan Bahadur S. Kumaraswami Reddiyar. |
| 27. „ T. M. Narayanaswami Pillai. | 57. Mr. T. M. Moidu Sahib. |
| 28. „ N. Siva Raj. | 58. Rao Bahadur B. Muniswami Nayudu. |
| 29. „ M. V. Gangadhara Siva. | 59. Diwan Bahadur A. M. M. Murugappa Chettiyar. |
| 30. Rao Sahib L. C. Guruswami. | |

Ayes.

- | | |
|------------------------------------|------------------------------------|
| 1. Mr. Sami Venkatachalan Chetti. | 17. Mr. C. Obi Reddi. |
| 2. „ S. Satyamurti. | 18. „ A. Parasurama Rao. |
| 3. „ C. V. Venkataramana Ayyangar. | 19. „ C. Ramasomayajulu. |
| 4. „ T. Adinarayana Chettiyar. | 20. „ P. Bhaktavatsulu Nayudu. |
| 5. „ P. Anjaneyulu. | 21. Sriman Biswanath Das Mahasayo. |
| 6. „ P. C. Venkatapati Raju. | 22. Mr. A. Kaleswara Rao. |
| 7. „ J. A. Saldanha. | 23. „ R. Srinivasa Ayyangar. |
| 8. „ Abdul Hamid Khan Sahib. | 24. „ K. Koti Reddi. |
| 9. „ C. S. Govindaraja Mudaliyar. | 25. „ L. K. Tulasiram. |
| 10. „ G. Harisarvottama Rao. | 26. „ C. Marudavanam Pillai. |
| 11. „ C. N. Muthuranga Mudaliyar. | 27. „ K. Krishnaswami Nayakar. |
| 12. „ K. V. R. Swami. | 28. „ K. Madhavan Nayar. |
| 13. „ D. Narayana Raju. | 29. „ C. Venkatarangam Nayudu. |
| 14. Dr. B. S. Mallayya. | 30. „ B. Venkataratnam. |
| 15. Mr. K. Uppi Sahib. | 31. „ K. S. Sivasubrahmanya Ayyar. |
| 16. „ K. R. Karant. | |

Neutral.

- | | |
|---|-------------------------|
| 1. Dr. (Mrs.) S. Muthulakshmi Reddi. | 4. Mr. R. Nagan Gowda. |
| 2. Diwan Bahadur E. N. Arogyaswami Mudaliyar. | 5. „ P. Siva Rao. |
| 3. Mr. Ramanath Goenka. | 6. „ K. P. Raman Menon. |
| | 7. „ C. Gopala Menon. |

Ayes 31. Noes 59. Neutral 7.

The motion was lost.